



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5225		
Country/Region:	Mozambique		
Project Title:	Mozambique Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	131965 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; CCM-5; CCM-2; CCM-3; SFM/REDD+-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,319,635
Co-financing:	\$61,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$67,819,635
PIF Approval:	April 29, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	June 20, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Nagda Kiveu

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: Yes. Same as PCN/PIF stage.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: Yes. Same as PCN/PIF stage.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: The project is a grant.
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: Yes. Same as PCN/PIF stage.
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: Yes. Same as PCN/PIF stage.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: Yes. Sa
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: Yes.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: Yes.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: Please see Q14.
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: No. A more detailed description and analysis of the key drivers of carbon depletion is expected. Paragraph 14 Annex 8 identifies three key drivers of carbon depletion: conversion into

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI. FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design			<p>agriculture, forest extraction for biomass consumption and illegal logging.</p> <p>a) Regarding the latter driver (illegal logging) please clarify (i) whether the project will address this driver; (ii) if yes, how; (iii) whether other initiatives are already in place to address this driver; (iv) whether the proposed project activities or other identified complementary initiatives have adequately identified the key stakeholders for this drivers and have designed activities with these stakeholders at the correct scale.</p> <p>b) Regarding the biomass consumption driver: please detail who the stakeholders involved are, where they are located and how the charcoal value chain is currently organized. This information should then be used to demonstrate that the proposed activities under Component 4 can adequately address this driver.</p> <p>c) Regarding the first driver (conversion into agriculture), please detail which stakeholders are involved (local only or also stakeholders from outside the targeted zones) and whether their motivation is purely linked to local livelihood improvement or also linked to specific products demand and the related investments.</p>
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: To be reviewed once the other comments have been addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?		<p>FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014:  Please note that any activity that increases forest cover does not necessarily contribute to the enhancement of carbon stocks at the global level. It mainly depends on what the drivers of carbon stock depletion are. For instance, carbon depletion driven by demand for fuel wood, charcoal, or timber cannot be addressed by activities protecting forest in targeted areas (e.g. biodiversity rich areas). Those activities will have a positive impact on BD but may not have such on CCM, they will only shift carbon depletion from one place to the other. Justification for CCM funding requires that the drivers (root causes) of carbon depletion are identified and that activities to address them are detailed prior to starting the project. More specifically, the description of the Project beneficiaries in paragraph 33 of the PAD indicates that protecting large areas of land in Mozambique has environmental benefits at the global level, especially in terms of mitigating greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. This may not be true if the drivers of GHG emissions are not adequately addressed. Please revise the wording used to take this into consideration.</p>
	14. Is the project framework sound and		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014:

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	sufficiently clear?		<p>a) The description of the project themes in the PAD (page 8: climate change=5% of all themes) is not consistent with the financing and co-financing presented in the GEF datasheet (CCM represents 40% of all financing and co-financing). Similarly, section I (strategic context) in the PAD document does not identify the CCM issues that the project intends to tackle. Please clarify and address the inconsistency in the two documents.</p> <p>b) For the CCM aspects, the links/complementarity between the different component and sub-components need to be strengthened or designed. Sub-component 2.1 mentions the support to policies and regulations (e.g. energy efficiency improvement ) to reduce GHG emissions from tourism facilities, but the project does not detail how this will be achieved, what policy/regulation is targeted and whether such (draft) policy/regulation would be applied to the investments supported by the other sub-components of the project. Also the link between sub-component 4.3 and the rest of the project activities is not explained.</p> <p>c) Regarding sub-component 4.3:  (i) Please detail and justify what stakeholders will be targeted and where for the energy efficiency improvement of charcoal kilns. (ii) Please detail how (through which mechanism) the project will support energy efficient charcoal kilns; (iii) Please clarify the energy</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>efficient kiln technologies the project is considering; (iv) Please detail how the support mechanism for improved kilns will be made financially sustainable to ensure replication and scaling up of similar activities beyond project completion.</p> <p>d) Concerning the activities aiming at addressing forest conversion to agriculture (agroforestry, conservation agriculture), the project assumes that alternative practices can be more attractive to local stakeholders than existing carbon depleting activities. (i) Please clarify whether this assumption has been tested: the calculations presented in Figure 2 of Annex 7 do not seem to take into account income from carbon depleting activities that local population would have to give up (provided enough incentive is provided) to switch to more sustainable practices; (ii) Please detail how (through which mechanism - paragraph 10 Annex 8 mentions "innovative mechanisms") the project will support alternatives to carbon depleting practices; (iii) Please detail how the support mechanism for alternatives to carbon depleting practices will be made financially sustainable to ensure replication and scaling up of similar activities beyond project completion; (iv) Details given in annex 7 seem to show that most of the local income increase induced by the project will come from tourism. This in turn raises question on the real need and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			efficiency of the livelihood activities proposed in component 4.3. Please clarify.
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: Component 4 includes different activities aiming at reducing carbon depletion. Annex 8 and the GEF CCM tracking tool assume that reduced deforestation would come from sustainable land management activities and from improved charcoal kilns. a) Since charcoal kilns improvement aim at tackling a key driver of deforestation please clarify whether the emission reductions associated with kilns improvement (Annex 8 paragraph 29) is part of the reduced deforestation estimated under paragraph 29 Annex 8 or is additional to it. Please justify. b) Please detail how the reduced deforestation impact under paragraph 29 Annex 8 has been estimated (which activity leading to what deforestation impact based on which assumption).
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?		
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)		
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: Yes.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: Table 1 page 26 of the PAD mentions only \$3.1 million of funding going to CCM and SFM related activities when the GEF datasheet indicates a total of \$36.1 million for these activities. Please detail what the co-financing of sub-component 4.3 will used for and how this co-financing will be essential to implementing the activities funded by the GEF.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: For the CCM tracking tool: a) Please fill in row 13. b) Please review row 18 with the correct approval date (6/20/2013). c) Please include only CCM funding/co-financing under row 19 and 24. d) Please see Q14 c) and revise rows 67 to 69 once it has been addressed. e) Please see Q15 and revise the mitigation figures once Q15 has been addressed.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: The description of the indicator used to monitor the project impact on annual CO2 emissions from deforestation (annex 1 of the PAD) should not be limited to the project impact on deforestation in protected areas (PAs) only. The success of facing deforestation drivers such as charcoal demand cannot be assessed through the monitoring of deforestation in PAs since deforestation can shift to other areas if the drivers are not addressed. Please revise the name and description of the indicator.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	4-25-13 Yes. This PCN is recommended.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		FJ/CCM - 4 Aug, 2014: No. Please address the above comments.
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 25, 2013	August 04, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.